# State of California Department of Water Resources

## PROPOSITION 50 WATER DESALINATION PROPOSAL SOLICITATION PACKAGE - 2006 CYCLE MINUTES OF 10 February 2006 PUBLIC WORKSHOP

### **Meeting Time and Location**

10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m., 10 February 2006, Hearing Room, Bonderson Building, 901 P Street, Sacramento, California.

#### **Attendance**

Over 12 members of the public, as well as four office staff, attended the workshop.

#### **Summary of Issues**

#### Introduction

William J Bennett, Chief of the Office of Water Use Efficiency and Transfers (OWET) of the Department of Water Resources welcomed the attendees and explained that Desalination is one of the tools in the Departments tool box as an important element of our future water supply. Mr. Bennett stated that the purpose of this competitive process is to encourage desalination projects and move the industry ahead.

The Chief of Water Recycling and Desalination Branch, Fawzi Karajeh, began the meeting to discuss the Proposition 50 Water Desalination Proposal Solicitation Package (PSP) - 2006 Cycle. Dr. Karajeh thanked Mr. Bennett for his support which has helped to streamline the process and permitted the quick disbursal of funds. The Purpose of this presentation is to provide guidance for submitting the proposals.

Dr. Karajeh presented a review of the PSP package. He emphasized the program objectives:

Assist local public agencies with the development of <u>new local potable</u> water supplies through the construction of brackish water and oceanwater desalination projects and help advance water desalination technology and its use by means of feasibility studies, research and development, and pilot and demonstration projects.

His Power Point presentation can be found at the following website address: (http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/recycle/DesalPSP/FinalPSP\_Presentation.pdf.)

#### **Audience Comments**

One participant asked how to quantify the future amount of recycled water available when there are unknown issues with water rights conflicts, system operation constraints, and environmental concerns.

The applicants need to convince the reviewers that their agencies are working in tandem with recycled water and desalination. They need to explain why desalination is important. Looking to the future, will the desalinated water supply produced cause the agency to discharge excess recycled water, or will it augment the supply.

In regard to matching funds, can a grantee from the 1<sup>st</sup> cycle apply some of their excess matching funds claimed in the 1<sup>st</sup> cycle toward matching funds for the 2<sup>nd</sup> cycle?

The applicant will have to provide new matching funds not listed in the  $1^{st}$  application. Applicants should be aware that the reviewers will be provided information from  $1^{st}$  cycle projects to verify that the  $2^{nd}$  cycle projects are separate and unique in scope and funding. For further assistance, applicants can contact Dr. Karajeh.

Can previously patented components be utilized in a project? If so, is the information of the patented component public information?

The previously patented components can be used in the projects. Because this grant program aims to advance water desalination technology and its use through information dissemination, the privatizing of the developed information and technology would be in opposition to the goals of the program. All Patent, Copyright and Trademark property rights arising from the project, to the extent that they are invented, created, produced or developed by Grantee(s) with funds provided by State, shall be in the public domain and may be used by any entity for any lawful purpose. In the case of previously patented components, they were developed outside of this funding program and their specific details are not required to be in the public domain.

Should an applicant submit nine complete packages (one original and eight copies) with attachments: letters of recommendation, plans and specifications, etc.?

The applicant should provide complete packages that will assist the reviewers to score and rank the project. For example, applicants should attach letters of recommendation to each copy, however, large volumes of information, such as plans and specifications, CEQA / NEPA documentation, etc., should be provided only after the project has been selected for a grant.

How is the technical review committee selected? What type of expertise do you plan to have on the review panel?

We anticipate that the technical review team will consist of members from state, federal, outside stakeholder groups that do not have a conflict of interest. The technical team will provide DWR management with the recommended funding list. The plan is that the review panel will include experts in both brackish and seawater desalination with specialties in the various processes such as reverse osmosis and distillation, as well as experts in energy, economics, conservation, environmental, and water quality issues.

Are all the 1st cycle proposals accessible online?

Only the abstracts of the granted projects are available online. Applicants can formally request and receive electronic copies of these awarded projects' applications from the 1<sup>st</sup> cycle.